



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Greek traditions of Sesostris, Senwosret I. is shown by the monuments to have been the first Egyptian conqueror of Nubia. Sethe (p. 17) places the southern limit of his conquest at Wadi Halfa, just below the second cataract, his triumphal tablet¹ having been found at that place. But it was at least 40 miles further south than this, for the list of conquered districts on the above tablet contains the name Sha't (*Š't*). Now Sha't is mentioned some 500 years later by Thutmose (Thotmes) III. on the walls of his temple at Kummeh (40 miles above Wadi Halfa) as the place where the stone for this temple was obtained. Hence Sha't is in the vicinity of this temple, and of course above it on the river.² As Kummeh on the east shore, and its pendant fort on the west shore, formed the extreme southern frontier of Nubia afterward, permanently maintained by Senwosret I.'s family (the Twelfth Dynasty), the interesting fact appears that he himself conquered to the extreme limit all the territory afterward held by his dynasty. This fact is quite sufficient to account for the initial fame of his achievements, which ultimately made him the hero of tradition, absorbing not merely the reputations of the other Senwosrets of his dynasty, but also much of the glory of the Asiatic conquests which culminated 500 years later.

Sethe's results therefore add not a little lustre to the name of Senwosret I., the conqueror of Nubia, nearly 2000 B. C., and lend new dignity to the great Twelfth Dynasty. He is also to be congratulated on a brilliant and solid contribution to the study of Greek sources, and he has incidentally again illustrated how nearly useless for early Egyptian history such sources are, unless controlled by contemporary monuments.

JAMES HENRY BREASTED.

The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship and Polity. By JAMES VERNON BARTLET, M.A., Mansfield College, Oxford. [Ten Epochs of Church History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xlv, 542.)

HISTORIES of the Apostolic Age of the Christian Church vary somewhat painfully with the country in which they are written. Weizsäcker in Germany, McGiffert in America, Bartlet in England present diverse pictures according to their measure of scientific spirit and their critical judgments as to the date and value of the sources. The comfort which perplexed students have felt in the growing consensus of German critics respecting the chronology of early Christian documents will be disturbed by this work of Professor Bartlet, whose canon of apostolicity is more confident even than that of the early Church, and whose chronological distribution of the documents is sadly at variance with modern German and

¹ The writer is about to publish the first complete copy of this tablet in the next number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, London. ("The Wadi Halfa Stela of Senwosret I.")

² The second cataract extends below the temple, hence the Sha't quarries must have been *above* the temple, for it is impossible to drag stone boats *up* the cataract.

American tendencies. The preface makes a good impression: "This is the crucial question for every student of the Apostolic Age: 'What think you of Acts—is it genuine history or has idealism largely come between its author and the reality?'" Ramsay's glorification of Luke as "among the historians of the first rank" is then contrasted with McGiffert's opinion that the author of Acts is inaccurate because of prepossessions of his own time. Bartlet promises to "let his decision between the two views work itself out gradually through discussion of each point on its own merits." The general reader will perhaps make from this the mistaken inference that the characteristic result of severe historical criticism is represented by McGiffert. Dr. Cone's careful work seems to be unknown and Weizsäcker's classic treatise, which in its comparison of Acts and the Pauline epistles is a masterly instance of historical method, is all but ignored. Ramsay, Hort and Sanday have had the chief influence on the work. In the discussion of each point as it emerges we have a modified exhibition of Ramsay's treatment of Acts, the result of which is the obscuration of the real Paul and a failure to grasp the issues. A passive reader will hardly discover what the problems of this period are. Whoever tamely accepts with Bartlet the account in Acts xvi: 3, which narrates Paul's circumcision of the son of a Jewish mother and a Greek father in order to please the Jews of the neighborhood, should rouse himself by reading the fifth chapter of Galatians, which, according to Bartlet, had only just been written: "Behold I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." To reconcile the story in Acts with this is a psychological impossibility and the details of Mr. Bartlet's discussions are vitiated by his inability to grasp such downright antagonisms.

Another defect of the book is that which is so pronounced a characteristic of Ramsay, an *alles wissen wollen*, which, united with an exaggerated valuation of the sources, ends in a habit of extracting large and ingenious references from slight and innocent remarks. We have several allusions to Luke's "subtle, allusive manner." This subtle indirectness, for example, at the close of Acts leaves us "the suggestion that the centre of the heathen world is destined to supersede the capital of Judaea as the centre of the Kingdom of God." By the same ingenuity of inference Paul's residence in Rome, enabling him to gaze forth from the centre of the world of men, is made to explain the more advanced cosmological conception of Christ in Colossians and Ephesians. The determination to know everything has an extreme illustration with the brief words of Acts, xiii: 3.—"They had also John as assistant." This is expanded as follows: "Besides looking after the material side of their arrangements, he probably helped to baptize converts and to teach them as a 'catechist' certain simple facts about Jesus the Christ and some of his notable sayings." Obviously Mr. Bartlet's work might have been briefer. He is somewhat bothered that Luke should repeat without modification the large predic-

tion of Agabus about a famine over the *whole* world, though he is calm over the general early predictions of a speedy end of all things. The concern shown is like that of the German rationalists who amended the hymn, "*es schläft die ganze Welt*," by the more accurate substitution of "*die halbe*."

In the second part of the work we have a careful and interesting exposition which depends for its truth upon the author's more than doubtful critical views. The Epistle of James is from 44-49 A. D. and therefore one of the earliest of Christian compositions. Its silence about Jesus is due to the fact that it is addressed in part to non-believing Jews. This quiet moralistic discourse surprisingly suggests to Mr. Bartlet the tone of Francis of Assisi and Savonarola. The Epistle to the Hebrews, probably written by Apollos in 62 A. D., is addressed to Christian Jews in Caesarea, and we are furnished with an imaginative description of the reading of the Epistle to the church meeting in Caesarea and of the effect produced. This reads somewhat strangely after Zahn's powerful argument—reinforced by Harnack—that the Epistle was written to a *Hausgemeinde* in Rome. II. Peter, genuine in part, is prior to I. Peter, and the latter, written 62-63, after Paul's death, uses Paul's phraseology in order to show how thoroughly Peter was one with Paul in thought. The Apocalypse is by the Apostle John, 75-80 A. D., and a period of fifteen more years is thought to have intellectually and theologically transformed the Apostle so that he could write the Fourth Gospel and completely abandon his eschatology. The *Didache* is brought into the account as a growth in three stages between 50 and 80 A. D. Use also is made of the Epistle of Barnabas (70-75 A. D.) as well as of Jude (70-80 A. D.) who writes not against Gnostics but Nicolaitan antinomians. These opinions will indicate sufficiently the resultant construction of the Apostolic Age, a construction which does not by consistency and plausibility lend aid to the judgments on which it is based.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

Christianity in the Apostolic Age. By GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D., LL.D., recently Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. [Historical Series for Bible Students, Vol. VIII.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. xx, 343.)

WHILE it is true that critical scholarship has outgrown most of those extravagances that marked its first stages, and has become, relatively speaking, conservative, all recent volumes of any importance upon the Apostolic Age,—unless we may accept the work of Zahn,—have shown great caution and discrimination in the use of the book of Acts as an historical source, and have shown a tendency to recognize several of the epistles of the New Testament as either reworkings of apostolic materials or as pseudonymous. It would seem, therefore, impossible for an historian of the period to avoid the serious discussion, or at least to escape